

COUNCIL
110th session
Agenda item 18(d)

C 110/WP.2
16 July 2013
Original: ENGLISH

DISCLAIMER

As at its date of issue, this document, in whole or in part, is subject to consideration by the IMO organ to which it has been submitted. Accordingly, its contents are subject to approval and amendment of a substantive and drafting nature, which may be agreed after that date.

EXTERNAL RELATIONS

(d) Relations with non-governmental organizations

Report of the Group of Council Members

1 As instructed by the Council, the Group of Council Members met on 15 and 16 July 2013, under the chairmanship of Mr. Brad Groves (Australia), to review and advise the Council on new applications for consultative status submitted by the following organizations:

- Euroshore International (Euroshore); and
- the Security Association for the Maritime Industry (SAMI),

as annexed to document C 110/18(d).

2 The group was also instructed to advise the Council in the context of the biennial review of organizations already in consultative status with IMO, as contained in document C 110/18(d)/1.

3 The group was composed of representatives from the delegations of Australia, China, Liberia, the Netherlands and the United States of America. Representatives from the delegations of Cyprus, the Republic of Korea and Singapore also participated in the discussions of the group.

4 The group reviewed the applications and the information provided, in accordance with the Rules Governing Relationship with Non-Governmental International Organizations ("the Rules") and the *Guidelines on the Grant of Consultative Status* ("the Guidelines"). The views of the group are given below.

New applications for consultative status

Euroshore International (Euroshore)

5 The group was of the opinion that Euroshore did not meet one of the rules for the granting of consultative status, namely being truly international (rule 5 of the Rules).

6 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council not to grant consultative status to Euroshore.

Security Association for the Maritime Industry (SAMI)

7 The group was of the view that the Security Association for the Maritime Industry (SAMI) is a newly-formed organization which meets the relevant Rules and Guidelines but needs to demonstrate its ability to contribute to the further work of the Organization.

8 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council to grant consultative status to SAMI, on a provisional basis, for no more than two years, after which a review should be conducted. As regards the classification of organizations in consultative status by interests/activity, the group agreed that SAMI should be placed under the Security category.

Biennial review of organizations in consultative status

9 As instructed by the Council, the group carried out a preliminary review of the organizations currently in consultative status with IMO, in accordance with the Rules Governing Relationship with Non-Governmental International Organizations and the *Guidelines on the Grant of Consultative Status*. The views of the group are given below.

Organizations in consultative status on a provisional basis

10 The group was of the view that SYBAss, Pacific Environment, CSC, BIC and IIMA have substantially contributed to the work of IMO during the biennium under review.

11 The group, therefore, decided to recommend to the Council to convert the consultative status granted to these organizations on a provisional basis to full consultative status.

Review of the list of remaining organizations in consultative status

12 The group noted that there is one organization that did not attend any IMO meetings or submit any documents during the period under review, namely The European Federation of Insurance Intermediaries (BIPAR).

13 The group also noted that BIPAR had previously been requested to confirm whether it wished to maintain its consultative status with IMO at C 66 (June 1991) and C 86 (June 2001) due to its lack of participation in IMO's work in the relevant biennia.

14 Therefore, the group decided to recommend to the Council that BIPAR's consultative status be withdrawn.

15 In addition, the group noted that five other organizations only attended one meeting during the biennium under review. These are:

- the International Salvage Union (ISU);
- the Iberoamerican Institute of Maritime Law (IIDM);
- the International Ocean Institute (IOI);
- the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW); and
- the Global Maritime and Training Association (GlobalMET).

16 The group noted that GlobalMET and IFAW substantially contributed to IMO's work by submitting a number of documents to IMO meetings during the biennium and, therefore, the group recommended that no further action with regard to these two organizations be taken.

17 With regard to IIDM and ISU, the group noted that these two organizations did not submit any documents during the biennium under review. Therefore, the group decided to recommend to the Council that they be reminded of the necessity to fulfil their obligations in accordance with the Rules and the Guidelines and that, should there be no improvement of their performance, their status may be withdrawn.

18 The group also noted that the only meeting IOI attended during the biennium was a London Convention/London Protocol meeting. It was also highlighted that Greenpeace International attended four meetings in the last biennium. However, these were all London Convention/London Protocol meetings. The group was informed that, in the previous biennium, these organizations had attended both IMO and London Convention/London Protocol meetings.

19 The group noted that the London Convention and the London Protocol have their own rules and criteria for the participation of international non-governmental organizations at their meetings (resolution LDC.30(11), document LC 28/15, annex 4 and rules 3 and 4 of the Rules of Procedure for consultative and special meetings under the London Convention).

20 After significant discussion, the group was of the view that the review of organizations' participation in London Convention/London Protocol meetings fell under the rules and criteria of the London Convention/London Protocol, and, therefore, consideration of the review of consultative status with IMO should be treated separately.

21 The group was of the view that attendance and submission of documents to London Convention/London Protocol meetings may not be considered as fulfilling the obligations as an organization in consultative status with IMO in accordance with the Rules and the Guidelines and, therefore, should not be taken into account in future biennial reviews.

22 Notwithstanding the above, the group agreed to recommend to the Council that IOI and Greenpeace International be reminded of the difference between the IMO Rules and Guidelines and the rules and criteria for the participation of international non-governmental organizations at the London Convention and Protocol meetings.

23 Highlighting that all non-governmental international organizations in consultative status with the Organization have the obligation to make a substantial contribution to the work of the Organization, the group noted that, as shown in annex 2 to document C 110/18(d)/1, a number of organizations have only had a limited participation in the work of IMO during the period under review, and recommended to the Council that the requirement to contribute substantially to the work of IMO be underlined in the Council's decisions on this matter.

Action requested of the Council

24 The Council is invited to:

- (i) note the group's recommendations with respect to new applications for consultative status and decide as it may deem appropriate;

- (ii) note the group's recommendations with respect to the organizations in consultative status on a provisional basis and decide as it may deem appropriate;
 - (iii) note the group's recommendations with respect to the remaining organizations in consultative status and decide as it may deem appropriate; and
 - (iv) concur with the view that attendance and submission of documents to London Convention/London Protocol meetings should not be taken into account in future biennial reviews.
-